

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 27, 2007. Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 5, 13 and 20 are being amended.

The Examiners are thanked for extending the courtesy of an interview on Tuesday April 24, at 11:00 AM PST. During the interview, the Examiners indicated that Humphrey did not teach or suggest the visual proximity of the displays and that visual proximity was preferred over physical proximity. The Examiners also made helpful suggestions for inclusion in Claim 13.

Claims 1-20 remain for the Examiner's consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 20 has been amended to depend from Claim 19. The Examiner is thanked for his careful reading of the claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 13 has been amended to direct the claim to statutory subject material. The Examiner is thanked for his careful reading of the claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 101 rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Humphrey et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0003039) hereinafter *Humphrey*.

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to include the limitation that “wherein at least a first display is in visual proximity to a second display”. *Humphrey* does not disclose that the displays are in visual proximity (a word search found one occurrence of the word ‘visual’ which related to code operating on visual elements (see [0036])). Since *Humphrey* does not disclose a first display in visual proximity of a second display, it does not anticipate Claims 1 and 5.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the limitation that “wherein at least a first display is in physical and visual proximity to a second display”. Since *Humphrey* does not disclose a first display in physical and visual proximity of a second display, it does not anticipate Claim 13.

Claims 2-4, 8-12 and 16-20 each depend directly or indirectly from currently amended Claims 1, 5 and 13 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claims 1, 5 and 13 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 102 rejection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-7 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Humphrey in view of Krzyzanowski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0098456).

Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitation that “wherein at least a first display is in visual proximity to a second display”. Since *Humphrey* does not teach or suggest a first display in visual proximity of a second display, Claim 5 is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the limitation that “wherein at least a first display is in physical and visual proximity to a second display”. Since *Humphrey* does not teach or suggest a first display in physical and visual proximity of a second display, Claim 13 is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 5-6 and 14-15 each depend directly or indirectly from currently amended Claims 5 and 13 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claims 5 and 13 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 103 rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 23, 2007

By: ./Anthony G. Craig/
Anthony G. Craig
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910